DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 450 SO 012 150

AUTHOR Sady, Rachel Reese
TITLE Teaching About Ethnocentrism. Occasional Paper No. 3.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 64
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; *Anthropology; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; *Ethnocentrism; Historiography; *History Instruction; Secondary Education; Social Studies; United States History
IDENTIFIERS Anthropology Curriculum Study Project

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the relevance of studying ethnocentrism in the secondary level social studies classroom. The study of ethnocentrism (a people's assumption that their way of life is the right way) allows students to share in the methodology of historiography, helps them to be aware of the importance of ideas and attitudes as historical data, and leads them to question cultural stereotypes. Ethnocentrism may be introduced in several ways. Students can discover how tribal peoples regard themselves by examining their group labels, by examining the concept of manifest destiny in American history, and by reading descriptions of American Indian cultures, autobiographies, and other ethnographic accounts in which custom appears as an integral element of a functioning culture. A brief description of the culture of the Plains Indians is provided as an example. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179450

Teaching About Ethnocentrism

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Louise Charles, NSF
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Rachel Reese Sady
Project Associate

SP 012 150

Occasional Paper No. 3
Anthropology Curriculum Study Project
5632 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637

TEACHING ABOUT ETHNOCENTRISM

by

Rachel Reese Sady

Anthropologists have developed a body of concepts that are essential to a study of man and his world, and the anthropologists who are convinced that there is great good to be gained from exploring these concepts at an early age are among those mobilizing to improve the secondary school social studies courses. At the same time that these anthropologists, through a committee appointed by their national professional association,[1] have been defining and demonstrating the potentiality of their discipline for the social studies, some educators have been turning to anthropology as a source both of data and of organizing or unifying concepts. This convergence suggests that there will be increasing discourse and co-operation between teachers and anthropologists, leading to a better understanding of anthropology by the former and of classroom needs and practicalities by the latter.

Some of the concepts that have been suggested for high-school discussion are culture, culture area, culture pattern and values, social organization, role and status, and ethnocentrism. These and others are expected to be stressed in much of the course material now being prepared jointly by teachers and anthropologists. However, since many teachers may be convinced of the general value of anthropology without being sure exactly how to use it in the classroom, it may be worthwhile to examine in some detail one concept, that of ethnocentrism, first as to its relevance to social studies courses, and second as to how it can be conveyed in social studies courses.

Relevance: "History Is a Can of Worms"

The concept of culture is central to a cluster of anthropological ideas, including ethnocentrism. "Culture," as anthropologists use the term, means the total learned or acquired content (values, habits, knowledge, attitudes, things) and pattern (the way these elements are related to each other) of a people's way of life. This concept must be clearly distinguished from the usual use of the word "culture" in the restricted meaning of the

artistic and intellectual life. Once this is done, it is easily understood. The anthropological use of the term implies a recognition of the integral nature of a culture, that its parts can be understood only in the context of the whole. The idea of ethnocentrism is meaningful only as one facet of the larger concept of culture, and an awareness of ethnocentrism is just one of many approaches to understanding the life-way of a people.

Ethnocentrism means a people's assumption that their way of life is the right way, or human way. All peoples tend to be ethnocentric, and this fact makes clear much about human behavior. This is not a novel idea to teachers, of course, but the idea is likely to be quite fresh to the young student, especially as applied to his own society and to himself.

Ethnocentrism poses an omnipresent problem for history writers. A news magazine last year, reporting on one of several attempts to bring the social sciences to bear on the social studies, commented that the task might be difficult, more difficult than drawing from the physical or natural sciences:[2]

> But history is a can of worms: its "truths" tend to be value judgments, not physical facts. However much a superb teacher leads a student to true investigation, not timid indoctrination, the final conclusion is partly subjective.

History is written by historians, and since any historian is steeped in his own particular culture, he expresses value judgments shaped by ethnocentrism. The techniques of historiography can sophisticate us in this realization and blunt some of the uglier consequences, but they cannot obliterate the fact. The goal of objectivity in writing or teaching history, and the difficulty of achieving this goal, are both well documented by the record of history textbook reform, and a brief review of this record will demonstrate the problem and suggest a partial solution.

World concern over ethnocentrism in history textbooks was finding expression in charges of chauvinism as early as the nineteenth century. But the period between the two world wars saw the greatest momentum in international efforts to revise textbooks, as an express contribution to attempts to maintain peace. Thus the League of Nations, underlining the need for studying global history, actually set up procedures for its members to delete or modify "objectionable" statements, purporting to be fact, in the texts of other countries, and then tightened these procedures so that not only misstatement of fact but even a "spirit of animosity" could be charged. As it developed, these procedures remained largely unused, but continued international interest in the problem was subsequently reflected in a series of UNESCO studies, the original of which was entitled Looking at the World through Textbooks.

In the United States, concern with the problem centered initially on British-American relations, with critics charging that patriotic American historians taught children to hate the British, particularly through their versions of the American Revolution. After World War I, there was considerable revision of textbooks, both to bring the books up to date and to reflect a more friendly attitude toward England, but revisionists pointed out that, in spite of these improvements, nationalism persisted in the textbooks and in violation of that principle of modern scholarship which emphasizes numerous possible interpretations of any single event. In the course of time, the discussion of nationalism in the textbooks, and its effect on shaping attitudes and hence the issues of war and peace, gradually gave way to studies of textbook treatment of specific countries or areas, such as France, Germany, the Far East, and Latin America. Also, texts were searched for "hidden bias" about minority groups within the United States. With World War II, the scope of discussion broadened beyond nationalism, to focus on cultural differences in general, as affecting value judgments everywhere, and on the need to write truly global histories as opposed to stories of Western civilization alone.

Today's headlines announce more discoveries of ethnocentrism or bias in the textbooks, as professional and civic groups continue to examine texts for "slanted" history. Even the old problem of the American Revolution is to the fore again, as a group of British and American scholars together examine the high-school texts of both countries for bias and error in the presentation of our shared history.

Such efforts to improve the textbooks, although sometimes complicated by varying judgments as to where extirpation of bias ends and censorship begins, are gradually becoming effective. But while historiography can do much to sort out the worms of history for the young student, can protect him from crudely ethnocentric interpretation, it cannot ever do the whole job. The student needs to know about ethnocentrism, to learn to think critically. Deep familiarity with the concept itself is one of the best methods of achieving some objectivity in handling the wriggling facts of history.

Introducing Ethnocentrism

There are any number of ways a teacher might wish to introduce and develop in the classroom the idea of ethnocentrism, all of which would go beyond a simple definition of the concept to bring out its implications and to arouse student interest. A teacher's choices might depend in part on whether courses are organized to set aside time for consideration of

concepts or whether all of the course content is treated chronologically, and in part on whether broad survey courses are being taught or judicious "postholing" is planned. Most important, choices would depend on the teacher's own style, which may range from explicit presentation of material to helping children form for themselves the ideas implicit in the material. The suggestions below exemplify the possibilities.

We Are The People. One of the assets of anthropology is the intrinsic interest of much of its data, which surely must be as fascinating to the young student as to the general adult reader. A good starting place to discover how tribal, or more simply organized, peoples regard themselves, is to look at the group labels they apply to themselves. The names by which we know such peoples are quite often descriptive or even denigrating nicknames that were applied to them by their enemies, such as "water-greens eaters," "big ears," "flat heads," or, simply, "enemy." The names which they apply to themselves are more revealing. The Navaho refer to themselves as Diné, meaning "people." The Polar Eskimo call themselves Inuit or "men." In South America, the Yahgan Indians call themselves Yamana or "human beings." The Aymara presumably do the same, since they call their language "human speech." Another South American group calls itself Che or "people," and sometimes refines this to Re Che or "real people." An example from Asia are the Ainu, whose name to them means "man," and, from Africa, the Hottentots, who call themselves Khoi-khoin or "men of men."

These group labels, persisting from times when peoples of the globe lived in comparative isolation, seem to say, "We are the people," and this impression can be confirmed by reference to other cultural facts about each group. A people's origin myth, which tells the story of creation as they believe it, often refers to the creation of their own group as peopling the world — that is, the only world that counts. For just one example, an early traveler in America noted that the Mandan Indians of the Plains asserted that they were the first people created on earth.

The notion that "We are the people," that how we look at the world about us is the right and natural way, that our values are the true values—this is the core of ethnocentrism. Being ethnocentric, tribal peoples conceived of those others across the mountain, or down the river, those perpetrators of dreadful deeds and possessors of fiendish customs, as subhuman, and not to be treated as people at all. The Yahgan, mentioned above as calling themselves "human beings," were generation after generation attacked by their neighbors, the Caingua and Guaraní, who felt the Yahgan to be beneath contempt, and hardly human at all.

But ethnocentrism was and is by no means peculiar to such small groups of semi-isolated peoples with little of the scientific and technological knowledge characteristic of more civilized societies. Additional material that might be drawn on for high-school students would exemplify how some of the peoples of the great civilizations have regarded themselves. Some of the rich sources of material on ancient China's ethnocentrism have already been tapped for world history textbooks, which describe the disdain of the Chinese for foreign "long-nosed barbarians." But many other examples from China are available.

Thus, in designs on the backs of bronze mirrors of the Han Dynasty of the first century A.D., the earth is represented by a large square, and a smaller square in the exact center stands for China—the Middle Kingdom. Rectangles extending in the four directions are the "Four Seas," which are not oceans, but rather the lands of the barbarians surrounding civilized China. Representations of strange birds and animals, and equally strange men (barbarians), sometimes dot these seas. The sky, sun, and moon are also symbolized on the mirrors, and reflect the Chinese philosophic ideal that to be central to the universe is to be in harmony with nature.

Ethnocentrism is quite explicit in statements of some Chinese thinkers. One philosopher, elaborating on Confucianism, asserted that certain ideas should be rejected as inherently evil precisely because they were foreign. And a seventeenth-century nationalist, Wang Fu-chih, propounded the following in particular reference to the Manchus:[3]

> Any strife with the barbarians the Middle Kingdom should not call a war.... For to annihilate them is not cruel, to deceive them is not unfaithful, to occupy their territory and confiscate their property is not unjust....

Wang Fu-chih believed that to bring the barbarians under Chinese rule was in accord with the harmony of nature. This proponent of the manifest destiny of the Chinese further explained:[4]

> Good faith and righteousness are principles to be practiced between one man and another, but they are not to be extended to an alien species.

Similar illustrations are abundant in the literature on other ancient civilizations. The Greeks, for example, used the actual word "barbarian" exactly as the Chinese used its analogue. In modern times, and closer to home, Great Britain, France, and other Western nations have all shared this human tendency to believe that their own way is the best. But we need

not fish in such Western waters for capsule illustrations of ethnocentrism. Students can profitably be asked to consider some of our own history in the light of that concept.

Ethnocentrism and Manifest Destiny. Because our national heritage is one of cultural diversity and our past is studded with confrontations of cultures, the concept of ethnocentrism is relevant to countless episodes and themes in American history. One such theme is the doctrine of manifest destiny. This theme is particularly appropriate for examination from an anthropological point of view by young students because the relationship between the doctrine and ethnocentrism is readily apparent, the implications of that relationship for historical interpretations are easily grasped, and, in so far as American Indians are concerned, there is a wealth of anthropological material to draw upon.

The doctrine of manifest destiny is presented in American history courses as the strong advocation of the expansion of the United States to its limits as fixed by nature—limits which were variously interpreted at different times with respect to northern and southern boundaries, but which were almost unanimously understood to mean westward expansion and encroachment upon Indian lands. The attitudes of those who espoused the doctrine are described as a supreme confidence in the future of the young country, a contempt for those who might stand in the path of expansion, and a self-assurance that was supernaturally sanctioned. The latter was expressed, in a Democratic news organ of the time, in the first known use of the term "manifest destiny":

> Our manifest destiny (is) to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.

Manifest destiny followed twin paths in America, one the steppingstones of international conflict, including a war with Mexico, and the other that of an inexorable flow into Indian country. The latter path was traversed over two and a half centuries—from the Powhatan wars to the subjection of the last Plains tribe—and therefore provides a rich background for thinking about American history from differing cultural vantages.

Knowing about ethnocentrism affords the student a perspective for regarding frontier Indian-White relations which may be fresh to him, and yet is quite closely related to his teacher's repeated caution to "consider your source." The long series of clashes between Indians and Whites had quite a different look to the confident new Americans than to those old Americans whose cultures were giving way before the onslaught. The Indians' reactions involved the fact, not only that they were being

vanquished, but that their cultures were cast in molds very distinct from those forming the culture of the Whites. This raises a set of related queries for the student. What was it like to be an Indian? How did an Indian feel about himself and others, about the world around him? What were the important values in his way of life, and how did these values affect his views of the white Americans and their culture? Similar questions, which emphasize attitudes and ideas, can be asked about the vanquishers, the frontiersmen, so that the student is led to stand off from his own cultural history the better to see it clearly. The experiment of trying to look at particular events or institutions from two or more viewpoints -- that is, trying to grasp another group's reality and trying to see one's own reality with new vision—can result in a sense of both methods and problems in history.

How did the white Americans view the Indians? Indians were not always and in all places regarded in the same way, since the circumstances of culture contact and the backgrounds of both the colonizing Europeans and the Indians varied widely. Nevertheless, considering the long time and the great spaces involved in the interaction, there was remarkable consistency in the viewpoint of the white Americans, which stemmed from their conviction that their civilization represented progress and that this gave them a moral right to the land of the Indians. William Henry Harrison, Governor of Indiana Territory, expressed this in his rhetorical question, "Is one of the fairest portions of the globe to remain in a state of nature, the haunt of a few wretched savages, when it seems destined by the Creator to give support to a large population and to be the seat of civilization?" The Indians were savages, obstacles to progress, and, as the colonizers spread out, the only real difference of opinion became whether the Indians could be civilized or must be killed. This choice was succinctly put in a toast used in the Revolutionary Army: "Civilization or death to all American Savages!"

Some early colonizers believed that the Indians were subhuman ("tawney serpents" was one appellation, and, later, a reference was made to "the animals vulgarly called Indians"). and devout Puritans in New England thanked God for the smallpox epidemics which decimated the tribes. Other colonizers felt that the Indians were basically human, but must be saved from their miserable state of savagery by the civilizing influence of the new Americans. As time went on, this latter view became more popular among those farthest removed from Indian country. On the advancing frontier, the harsher viewpoint prevailed, as typified in a Topeka newspaper reference to Indians in 1867 as "a set of miserable, dirty, lousy, blanketed, thieving, lying, sneaking, murdering, graceless, faithless, gut-eating skunks... whose immediate and final extermination all men, except Indian agents and traders, should pray for."

The hard core of both these attitudes—that "We are the people" and that only our way is the right way—was ethnocentrism. It was the rare individual whose perception matched that of Benjamin Franklin when he wrote, bluntly, "Savages we call them because their manners differ from ours, which we think the perfection of civility; they think the same of theirs."

To discover how the colonizers and settlers viewed the Indian, and their version of events and circumstances surrounding our westward expansion, is comparatively easy, because this is the view of our own culture. In addition, documented analyses and syntheses comparing White and Indian views are available.[5] For courses where there is the time and inclination to use source material, another approach would involve students' acting as historians of attitudes. Illuminating sources are selections from the writings of early American historians such as Francis Parkman[6] and George Bancroft,[7] from political figures of the day such as Senator Thomas Hart Benton (who believed that "...the white race alone received the divine command to subdue and replenish the earth"),[8] as well as the reports of early Indian agents. A source which combines the ethnocentrism of Western man with a definitely non-American view is De Tocqueville's observations about Indians ("...it is the misfortune of the Indian to be brought into contact with a civilized people, who are also...the most grasping nation on the globe....").[9]

Whichever of these approaches is adopted, the student will discover that in considering how Americans thought about Indians, he will be learning less about the Indians than about the Americans.[10]

Understanding Other Cultures. But how did the Indians view these new Americans? Certainly the first colonizers must have seemed strange to the Indians—so strange that one group of Indians, so the story circulated, held some Spaniards under water to discover if they were mortal. In most places, however, the Indians first met the Europeans with friendly curiosity. This initial rapport did not last long, and as Indian and European cultures confronted each other throughout the continent and over the years, respective goals and ethics conflicted.

Our history books do not serve us so well on this question of how the Indians viewed the new Americans,[11] although the observations of Americans sympathetic to the Indians are helpful. Ben Franklin realized the validity of the Indian point of view, and was also exceedingly fond of stories illustrating it. It is he who told of the Indian chief who, in reply to an offer to educate a few Indian boys at Williamsburg College, declined because the Indians who had gone to American colleges had come back "bad runners, ignorant of every means of living in the woods, unable to bear either cold or hunger, knew neither how to build a cabin, take a deer,

or kill an enemy, spoke our languages imperfectly, were therefore neither fit for warriors, hunters, nor counsellors; they were totally good for nothing." The chief's offer to educate some young Virginians in the ways of the forest was doubtless also declined.

A reference to historical documents and the assumption of a humanitarian empathy with the Indians can suspend our ethnocentrism sufficiently to make us realize that many things that the new Americans did to the Indians in the name of doctrines associated with manifest destiny represented, even by our own standards, a long series of injustices.[12] But this is not the anthropological approach of understanding other cultures which is stressed here. The anthropological approach is to secure some knowledge of integrated Indian cultures as background for discovering the Indian view of the great changes wrought in aboriginal life by the advancing frontier. For this, selected readings would be descriptions of Indian cultures and excerpts from Indian autobiographies and other ethnographic accounts, in which an Indian custom does not stand out as strange but appears as an integral element of a functioning culture and therefore as simply another manifestation of fundamentally human ways. Choices of such material would vary with the particular period, place, or episode under study—whether the Black Hawk War or the expulsion of the Cherokee from Georgia in the early nineteenth century, or the later uprisings on the western Plains—but the material is available for all.

This anthropological approach can be exemplified, and the rich sources available hinted at, by a brief look at the culture of the Plains Indians—in particular, at their most significant ceremony, the Sun Dance.[13]

Plains culture, as it flourished after the seventeenth-century adoption of the horse, was a nomadic hunting and warring, highly individualistic, way of life. Plains values emphasized bravery, and the other personal virtues of generosity, self-control, self-reliance, and initiative. The economy of the area was based on hunting the migratory buffalo. Land was not conceived as individually owned, although band or tribal territories with vague boundaries were recognized. Actually, although ideas of land tenure and land use varied greatly among the American Indians, the buying and selling of land was practiced nowhere among them. ("What, sell land," exclaimed the Shawnee Tecumseh. "As well sell air and water. The great spirit gave them in common to all.") Horses, tipis, and other kinds of personal property were privately owned, as were such incorporeal items as songs, curing rites, and dances.

The Plains Indians differed from the frontier Americans not only economically but also politically and socially. Just as Chief Joseph of the Plateau Nez Perce reacted to Washington bureaucracy with, "The white

man has too many chiefs," so did the settlers fail to understand the limitations on the powers of the Indian chiefs in their loosely organized and loosely led bands. Chieftainship was acquired by achievement, usually in war, and depended on personal reputation and the particular task at hand—there were, for a prime example, different chiefs for war and for peace. In the last analysis, chiefly authority really depended on how many people would follow a leader, a system that was not clear to the authoritarian armies often sent to deal with the Indians.

Warfare, in the form of swift raids on other tribes to acquire honor, horses, and dominance in a buffalo-hunting territory, was a paramount motif in Plains life. War honors were graded, and the right to boast of prowess accrued for taking scalps or other war mementoes and, most importantly, for "counting coup"—that is, being the first, second, third, or fourth to touch an enemy. The highest honor of all accrued to the warrior who touched an unhurt enemy and left him alive. Another proof of bravery which rated high and was also the recognized way to acquire horses was to sneak them from an enemy camp—a tradition that was peculiarly suited to not setting well with White frontiersmen. In fact, much about Plains warfare was contemptible to the Whites, who regarded as treachery the traditional Plains pattern of deception and surprise attack. The Indians, on the other hand, who were accustomed to the quick sortie followed by a withdrawal to camp to claim and celebrate war honors, were repeatedly taken off guard during these celebrations by attacks from United States Army units whose goal in warfare was, not the garnering of honor, but strategic gain.

The Plains Indians were polygynous, and this marriage practice fitted well in a society where the hunter and warrior mortality was inevitably high and where it was a female responsibility to laboriously prepare the buffalo hides that were crucial to tribal life. Differences in family life and morals between the Whites and Indians are merely suggested in the comment of one anthropologist that his Crow interpreter twitted him about "the fact that while whites censured the Indian's immorality, a brother would not hesitate to speak freely with his sister, which no decent Crow would do."

The religion of the Plains focused on belief in a mysterious, divine force upon which depended the well-being and power of both the individual and the group. The individual sought his spiritual power by a solitary and ascetic vigil that culminated, if he were lucky, in a prophetic vision. Group ceremonies were similarly intended to achieve divine power, as well as tribal well-being, and the most important of these was the ceremony that takes its name from its climaxing event, the Sun Dance.

For the Plains Indians, the Sun Dance was the unifying ceremony in their lives, both spiritually and socially.[14] Every year, groups of bands met in separate camps for several days to perform a series of rituals dramatizing the principal values of Plains culture, and to enjoy, at the same time, a variety of social activities. At the climax in each camp, a few men, in fulfillment or in quest of visions, and to establish their bravery and generosity (since they provided food for the ceremony), tortured themselves in a dance by pulling against thongs which were attached to skewers pierced through their flesh. The resulting scars on chest and back remained as awesome witness to individual embodiment of the tribal virtues.

Religiously, this ceremony was believed to secure spiritual power or favor for a continued food supply and for the very life of the participating tribes. Socially, it reaffirmed the participants in their tribal membership and strengthened communal feelings of security. In a special rite of ear-piercing, parents promised to rear their children according to tribal law and custom; in this and other ways, children were educated and parents rededicated to tribal values.

The Whites found the self-torture involved in the Sun Dance repugnant, and as soon as the Indians were settled on reservations, Government and Mission worked together to ban the entire ceremony. When finally the performance of the Sun Dance was officially prohibited, this was in a way symbolic, since the prohibition coincided with the breaking up of the old way of life, so dependent on the disappearing buffalo, and the weakening of tribal unity and social controls. At the time of the prohibition, many Indians had already turned from the Sun Dance, their ceremony of life, to the messianic cult of the Ghost Dance, a religion embodying a last desperate hope.

The lengthy resistance of some Plains as well as other groups of Indians to accommodating themselves to European or American frontier culture has led to the constant refrain—repeated in textbooks today—that the American Indians refused to become civilized. This negative view of culture change might be supplanted by the positive recognition that Indian cultures were functioning, meaningful ways of life, and that to wonder at Indian persistence in their own ways means little more than to wonder at our forefathers' holding out against the virtues of "savagery." A less ethnocentric view of the American frontier will not only point this out but will also open the way for recognition that there was a culture exchange, that it went two ways, and that there was a deep influence of Indian culture on our own way of life, "our speech, our economic life, our clothing, certain indigenous religious cults, many of our curative practices, folk and concert music...."[15]

Conclusion

The fact that peoples are ethnocentric is fundamental to an understanding of both our own and other cultures, our own and others' histories. When knowledge about that fact is incorporated into the teaching of history, it allows students to share in the methodology of historiography, helps them to be aware of the importance of ideas and attitudes as historical data, and leads them to question cultural stereotypes of nobility and villainy when they occur in our history books. History presented in a cultural context provides a corrective for ethnocentrism without attempting its destruction—which, in any case, is neither possible nor desirable. This corrective, often referred to as cultural relativism,[16] is the knowledge that cultures differ in both time and space and that value systems, being part and parcel of the cultures, also vary. Individuals learn values (the real ones, that is, which are not necessarily the stated ones) from the culture in which they are brought up, and any other expectation is invalid.

The existence of cultural diversity does not negate the fact that cultures are fundamentally alike or that universal values exist. Indeed, some anthropologists consider the discovery of universal values by the comparative study of cultures to be their prime scientific interest. It does, however, warn against portraying the universal only in terms of our own historical particular. A corollary is the point of this paper, that because of ethnocentrism, the reality of history has more than one face.

The lesson to be learned from understanding ethnocentrism and cultural relativism has limitations which should be clear. Learning about such cultural concepts lays the groundwork for independent and critical thinking, but does not in itself solve specific world problems, current or historical. Since solutions derive from value-based actions, it is further evident that learning about these concepts should illuminate, not eliminate, our own values. Cultural explanations can help us understand institutions and events, but they certainly do not make us like them all. There is nothing in cultural relativism that requires us to approve of customs such as scalp-taking, head-hunting, or witch-burning.

We are ethnocentric, and we will act according to our own values. But we can recognize that values are not static, and we can temper our judgments and our actions with a cultural view of history. Anthropology, in telling students about the various worlds that result from constantly diversifying and adapting cultures, is also telling them a great deal about their own lives.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This Committee of the American Anthropological Association appointed Dr. Malcolm Collier of the University of Chicago to direct its Anthropology Curriculum Study Project in an effort to assess the potentiality of anthropology for secondary school courses and to prepare new material for classroom use. This article was written for the Project.

[2]Time Magazine, Feb. 1, 1963.

[3]Quoted from Ch'un-ch'iu Chia-shuo (1646) in Arthur F. Wright, ed., Studies in Chinese Thought (American Anthropological Association Memoir No. 75, 1953), p. 191.

[4]Ibid., p. 53.

[5]Teachers interested in synthesizing or illustrative material will find available two histories of the ideas of civilization, progress, and savagery. Roy Harvey Pearce's The Savages of America (Johns Hopkins Press, 1953) is directly related to the idea of manifest destiny; the whole may be somewhat difficult for many high-school students, but selected excerpts would be stimulating. Lewis Hanke's Aristotle and the American Indians (Hollis and Carter, London, 1959), primarily concerned with Spanish-Indian relations, documents in the clearest language the ethnocentrism shared by leading thinkers of Western civilization and aboriginal peoples of the world. A third volume, William Hagan's American Indians (University of Chicago Press, 1961), summarizes White-Indian relations throughout our history.

[6]Francis Parkman, History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac (Macmillan, 1929), pp. 1-3, 26-29, and 393.

[7]George Bancroft, History of the United States (Little, Brown, 1852), Vol. III, pp. 300-306.

[8]Selections from the speeches of Thomas Hart Benton are quoted in Pearce, op. cit.

[9]Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (Knopf, 1945), p. 347.

[10]For unique attempts to get people to be objective about themselves, portraits of Americans supposedly by outsiders are amusing and thought-provoking. Horace Miner's "Body Ritual among the Nacirema" (American Anthropologist, June, 1956) is one of these. Another shorter and simpler attempt is by Harold Courlander, On Recognizing the Human Species (Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith One Nation Library), pp. 8-10. Teachers themselves may be interested in the very sophisticated essay, "Talk with a Stranger," by Robert Redfield in The Social Uses of Social Science (the Papers of Robert Redfield, ed. Margaret Park Redfield, Vol. II, University of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. 270-83.

[11]Although there is a great deal of pertinent material in Pearce, op. cit., Hanke, op. cit., and Hagan, op. cit.

[12]Books that do this well are Hagan, op. cit.; John Collier, The Indians of the Americas (Norton and Co., 1947); and Oliver LaFarge, A Pictorial History of the American Indian (Crown, 1957). Collier and LaFarge also portray the cultures of Indian groups. A source of the early 19th century is the Moravian missionary, John Heckewelder, who gives "The Indian's Opinion of the White Man" in Albert Bushnell Hart, ed., American History Told by Contemporaries, Vol. III, pp. 467-71.

[13]The anthropological approach of understanding other cultures is concisely stated and clearly illustrated in a paperback book of that title by Ina Corinne Brown (Understanding Other Cultures, Prentice Hall, 1963). Anthropological data on the Plains Indians is abundant, but a few sources may be particularly useful in high schools. E. Adamson Hoebel's The Cheyennes: Indians of the Great Plains (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960) is a short but comprehensive study of one Plains group. Robert Lowie's Indians of the Plains (The Natural History Press, 1963) is a paperback edition of his original handbook written for the American Museum of Natural History. Mari Sandoz' Crazy Horse, the Strange Man of the Oglala (paperback edition, University of Nebraska Press, 1961) is fictionalized biography and ethnography. The Golden Age of American Anthropology, edited by Margaret Mead and Ruth Bunzel (Braziller, 1960), has the great advantage of bringing together in one place short selections from some of anthropology's classics on Plains culture, including George Bird Grinnell on the Cheyenne, Clark Wissler on the Blackfoot, Robert Lowie on the Crow, J. R. Walker and Leslie Spier on the Sun Dance, and James Mooney on the Ghost Dance. The Anthropology Curriculum Study Project will soon publish a case study, Kiowa Years, written by Alice Marriott expressly for high-school use.

[14]For short but excellent analyses of this ceremony, see Collier, op. cit., pp. 230-34, and Gordon MacGregor, Warriors without Weapons (University of Chicago, 1946), pp. 88-91. More detailed descriptions are available in Mead and Bunzel, op. cit.

[15]A. Irving Hallowell, "The Backwash of the Frontier; The Impact of the Indian on American Culture," in The Frontier in Perspective, ed. Walker Wyman and Clifton Kroeber (1957).

[16]There has been considerable discussion in the anthropological literature about cultural relativism and what it means. For teachers interested philosophically, there is the following bibliography: Ethel M. Albert, "Value Aspects of Teaching Anthropology," in The Teaching of Anthropology, ed. D. G. Mandelbaum, G. Lasker, and E. Albert (American Anthropological Association Memoir No. 94, 1963); David Bidney, "The Concept of Value in Modern Anthropology," in Anthropology Today, ed. A. L. Kroeber (University of Chicago Press, 1953); Melville Herskovits, Man and His Works, chapter on "The Problem of Cultural Relativism" (1948); Robert Redfield, The Primitive World and Its Transformations, chapter on "The Transformation of Ethical Judgment" (Cornell, 1953).